REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed July 26, 2005. Claims 1-27 were pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicant requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

I.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

A.   Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 26 are allowable over *Sheymov*.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by PCT Application WO0070458 to Sheymov, et al. ("*Sheymov*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that *Sheymov* does not describe, expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the claims. For example, Applicant's independent Claim 1 recites:

> A method for securing packet-based communications comprising:
> receiving at a first translation module a stream comprising a plurality of packets regarding a communication from a first user interface device intended for a second user interface device, each packet having an original destination address and an original source address; and
> for each of the packets, performing an address modification process including changing the original destination address to a selected one of a plurality of modified destination addresses assigned to a second translation module remote from the first translation module, wherein each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address for forwarding the packet to the second user interface device;
> wherein the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Sheymov* fails to teach every element of this claim.

1.   *Sheymov* does not teach that the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of and response to Applicant's previously submitted arguments with respect to *Sheymov*. However, Applicant maintains that *Sheymov* fails to disclose a method "wherein the address modification process is performed

independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device," as required by Claim 1.

The response in the *Office Action* cites to page 7, lines 16-18 in *Sheymov*, which recites:

> A management system 18 periodically changes the address for the computer 14 by providing a new address from a cyber address book 20 which stores a plurality of cyber addresses. Each new cyber address is provided by the management system 18 to the router 16 and to a user computer address book 22.

The *Office Action*, thus, apparently asserts that either the management system (Figure 1, item 18) or the router (Figure 1, item 16) performs the address modification process. However, the "actual communication functions are performed by the computer using the variable side of the 'address book' periodically updated by the [management system]." (pg. 14, lines 17-19). Specifically, a user's computer contains an address book that correlates a permanent alphabetic address with a variable cyber address. (pg. 6, lines 25-28). When a user wants to transmit a packet to the permanent alphabetic address for a remote computer, the user's computer automatically substitutes the corresponding variable cyber address from the address book. (pg. 7, lines 22-24). The management unit merely updates the cyber address in the user's computer address book.

Applicant's Claim 1 specifies that, for each packet in a received stream of packets, the address modification process includes "changing the original destination address to a selected one of a plurality of modified destination addresses." (emphasis added). In *Sheymov*, a user's computer addresses packets using cyber addresses contained in its user computer address book. If for argument's sake this is considered an address modification, this process is not "performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device," as required by Claim 1.

Thus, *Sheymov* does not describe, expressly or inherently, a method "wherein the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device," as required by Claim 1. Independent Claims 14, 20, and 26 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught by *Sheymov*. Because *Sheymov* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, every element of

independent Claims 1, 14, 20, and 26, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 14, 20, and 26 and their respective dependent claims.

> **2.** ***Sheymov*** **does not teach receiving at a first translation module a stream comprising a plurality of packets, where each packet has an original destination address.**

Claim 1 further requires "receiving at a first translation module a stream comprising a plurality of packets . . ., each packet having an original destination address." *Sheymov* does not disclose these claimed aspects

As teaching the original destination address, the *Office Action* points to the alphabetic destination address disclosed in *Sheymov* (pg. 7, lines 20-24). Applicant respectfully submits that *Sheymov*'s alphabetic destination address is not a part of any packet. *Sheymov* states that: "When the user wants to transmit a packet of information with the alphabetic address for the computer 14, this <u>alphabetic address is automatically substituted for the current numerical cyber address and used in the packet</u>." (pg. 7, lines 22-24; emphasis added). The packet with the current numerical cyber address is then transmitted to the "gateway router or bridge," which determines whether or not "the destination address is correct." (pg. 7, lines 25-28). Applicant's Claim 1 specifies that "<u>each packet [has] an original destination address</u>" and "the original destination address [is changed] to a selected one of a plurality of modified destination addresses," with this modification process taking place independently of the user interface devices. (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that, rather than including the alphabetic destination address as part of a packet, *Sheymov*'s alphabetic destination address is changed into the current numerical cyber address and the latter is included in a packet. The alphabetic destination address is never part of a packet. Rather, the cyber address is the only address used for a packet.

Thus, *Sheymov* does not describe, expressly or inherently, "receiving at a first translation module a stream comprising a plurality of packets . . ., each packet having an original destination address," as required by Claim 1. Independent Claims 14, 20, and 26 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught by *Sheymov*. Because *Sheymov* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, every element of independent Claims 1,

14, 20, and 26, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 14, 20, and 26 and their respective dependent claims.

      3.   *Sheymov* **does not teach that the modified destination addresses are resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address.**

Claim 1 further requires that "each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address for forwarding the packet to the second user interface device." *Sheymov* does not disclose these claimed aspects.

For these aspects, the *Office Action* points to *Sheymov*, page 7, lines 25-28, which recites:

> With the reference to Figures 1 and 2, when a packet is received by the gateway router or bridge 16 as indicated at 24, the cyber address is checked by the gateway router or bridge at 26, and if the destination address is correct, the packet is passed at 28 to the computer 14.

However, checking for a correct address does not disclose that "each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address for forwarding the packet to the second user interface device." Applicant respectfully submits that *Sheymov* provides no indication that the "selected modified destination addresses [are] resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address," as required by Claim 1. (emphasis added).

Thus, *Sheymov* does not describe, expressly or inherently, that "each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address for forwarding the packet to the second user interface device," as required by Claim 1. Independent Claims 14, 20, and 26 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught by *Sheymov*. Because *Sheymov* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, every element of independent Claims 1, 14, 20, and 26, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 14, 20, and 26 and their respective dependent claims.

B.   Claims 10-13 are allowable over *Munger*.

The Examiner rejects Claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0003116 to Munger, et al. ("*Munger*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that *Munger* does not describe, expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the claims. For example, Applicant's independent Claim 10 recites:

> A method for securing packet-based communications comprising:
> negotiating translation parameters with a remote device for a communication stream between a first user interface device and a second user interface device, the translation parameters comprising an original destination address, a plurality of available destination addresses, and an algorithm;
> determining a modified destination address from among the available destination addresses according to the algorithm;
> receiving a packet of the communication stream having the modified destination address; and
> changing the packet to have the original destination address, wherein the address change is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device.

Among other aspects, *Munger* does not disclose a method comprising "negotiating translation parameters . . . comprising an original destination address . . ." and "changing the packet to have the original destination address," as required by Claim 10.

As teaching "negotiating translation parameters . . . comprising an original destination address . . .," the *Office Action* points to *Munger*, paragraphs 0112 and 0117. In *Munger*, to establish a secure session with a router, a client computer sends a request that includes the client's current IP address and a known IP address for the router. (pg. 9, para. 0112). The router responds by sending "the transmit and receive hopblocks that the client 801 will use when communicating with the TARP router." (pg. 9, para. 0112). Applicant respectfully submits that *Munger*'s hopblocks fail to teach or suggest "an original destination address," as required by Claim 10. While *Munger* may discuss the transmission of addresses, none can be characterized as a negotiated "original destination address," since Claim 10 also requires, with respect to the original destination address, "changing the packet to have the original destination address, wherein the address change is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device." *Munger* provides no indication that any packet is changed to have the "original destination address," as required

by Claim 1. Further, *Munger* teaches away from later "changing the packet to have the original destination address," since *Munger* teaches the use of a different address for the ultimate delivery of a packet. (pg. 9, para. 0112 & 0115).

Thus, *Munger* does not describe, expressly or inherently, a method comprising "negotiating translation parameters . . . comprising an original destination address . . ." and "changing the packet to have the original destination address," as required by Claim 10. Because *Munger* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, every element of independent Claim 10, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 10 and its respective dependent claims.

II.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 6, 9, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Sheymov* in view of *Munger*. The Examiner also rejects Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Sheymov* in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/10091941 to Challenger, et al. ("*Challenger*").

A.   *Sheymov*, *Munger*, and *Challenger*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of dependent Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 25.

As described above, Applicant has shown that *Sheymov* fails to disclose all limitations of independent Claims 1, 14, and 20. Accordingly, *Sheymov* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 25 because these dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims. *Munger* and *Challenger* fail to remedy the deficiencies of *Sheymov*.

Thus, *Sheymov*, *Munger*, and *Challenger*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 25. Because the references fail to teach all limitations of the claims, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 25.

B. *Sheymov* **and** *Munger,* **whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of independent Claim 27.**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on the ground that *Sheymov* and *Munger,* whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 27, which recites:

> A method for securing packet-based communications comprising:
>
> detecting initiation of a communication stream at a first translation module, the communication stream comprising a plurality of packets from a first user interface device intended for a second user interface device, each packet having an original destination address and an original source address;
>
> identifying a second translation module remote from the first translation module based upon the original destination address;
>
> negotiating translation parameters for the communication stream with the second translation module, the translation parameters comprising an algorithm dictating how to select from among a plurality of modified destination addresses;
>
> receiving the packets; and
>
> for each of the packets, performing an address modification process including selecting one of the modified destination addresses according to the algorithm and changing the original destination address to the selected modified destination address, wherein each of the selected modified destination addresses is resolvable by the second translation module to the original destination address, wherein, except for a first one of the packets, each of the packets is changed to a different one of the modified destination addresses than a preceding one of the packets, and wherein the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device.

Among other aspects, *Sheymov* and *Munger,* whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a method "wherein the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device," as required by Claim 27. As described above, Applicant has shown that *Sheymov* fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Munger* also fails to teach or suggest this limitation. The *Office Action* cites *Munger,* page 8, paragraph 0109 as teaching that "the address change is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device." (*Office Action,* pg. 3, para. 3). While the router disclosed by *Munger* "issues separate transmit and receive hopblocks to its clients," this simply operates to

update information stored by the respective clients, similar to the system in *Sheymov*. It is the clients of *Munger* that perform actions (pg. 9, para. 0112 (The router communicates "the transmit and receive hopblocks that the client 801 will use when communicating with the TARP router.")).

Thus, *Munger* does not teach or suggest, a method "wherein the address modification process is performed independently from both the first user interface device and the second user interface device," as required by Claim 27. Because *Sheymov* and *Munger*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 27, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 27.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of the Application in any manner, the undersigned Attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

While no fee is believed to be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

Kurt M. Pankratz
Reg. No. 46,977

Date: October 26, 2005

Correspondence Address

Customer ID No. **05073**